arXiv:1406.7363v2 [cs.IT] 23 Sep 2014

On the Synchronization Rate for e-machines

Mikhail V. Berlinkov*

Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Ural Federal University, 620000 Ekaterinburg, Russia
berlm@mail.ru

Abstract. It is known, that an ϵ-machine is either exactly or asymptotically synchronizing. In the exact case, the observer can infer the current machine state after observing L generated symbols with probability $1 - a^L$ where $0 \leq a < 1$ is a so-called synchronization rate constant. In the asymptotic case, the probability of the correct prediction the current machine state after observing L generated symbols tends to 1 exponentially fast as $1 - b^L$ for $0 < b < 1$ and the infimum of such b is a so-called prediction rate constant.
Hence the synchronization and prediction rate constants serve as natural measures of synchronization for ϵ-machines. In the present work we show how to approximate these constants in polynomial time in terms of the number of machine states.

1 Preliminaries

A *deterministic finite automata* (DFA) $\mathscr{A}$ is a triple $\langle Q, \Sigma, \delta\rangle$ where Q is the state set, Σ is the input alphabet and $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \to Q$ is the *transition function*. If δ is completely defined on $Q \times \Sigma$ then $\mathscr{A}$ is called *complete*, otherwise $\mathscr{A}$ is called *partial*. The function δ extends uniquely to a function $Q \times \Sigma^* \to Q$, where Σ^* stands for the free monoid over Σ; the latter function is still denoted by δ. When we have specified a DFA $\mathscr{A} = \langle Q, \Sigma, \delta\rangle$, we can simplify the notation by writing $S.w$ instead of $\{\delta(q, w) \mid q \in S\}$ for a subset $S \subseteq Q$ and a word $w \in \Sigma^*$. In what follows, we assume $|\Sigma| > 1$ because the singleton alphabet case is trivial for considered problems. Given a subset of words $U \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and a state p denote by U_p the subset of words from U labeling some path from p in $\mathscr{A}$.

A DFA $\mathscr{A} = \langle Q, \Sigma, \delta\rangle$ is called *synchronizing* if there exists a word $w \in \Sigma^*$ such that $|Q.w| = 1$. Notice that here w is not assumed to be defined at all states. Each word w with this property is said to be a

* Supported by research grant of Prof. Jürgensen, University of Western Ontario, Canada

reset word for $\mathscr{A}$. The minimum length of such words is called the *reset threshold* of $\mathscr{A}$ and is denoted by $rt(\mathscr{A})$.

The synchronization of strongly connected partial automata as models of *ϵ-machines* is one of the central object for research in the theory of stationary information sources. The synchronization and state prediction for stationary information sources has many applications in information theory and dynamical systems. An ϵ-machine can be defined as a strongly connected DFA with a probability distribution defined on the outgoing arrows for each state, without states with *probabilistically equivalent future* (see [6],[7] for details). Hence by ϵ-machine we mean the tuple $\langle Q, \Sigma, \delta, \mathbf{P}\rangle$ where $\langle Q, \Sigma, \delta\rangle$ is the strongly connected partial automaton and $\mathbf{P} : Q \times \Sigma \mapsto R_+$[1] is the probability distribution on the outgoing arrows. Formally,

- $\sum_{a\in\Sigma} \mathbf{P}_q(a) = 1$ for each state $q \in Q$;
- $\mathbf{P}_q(a) = 0$ whenever a is undefined on $q \in Q$;
- for each states $p \neq q$ there is a word u such that $\mathbf{P}_p(u) \neq \mathbf{P}_q(u)$,

where the probability $\mathbf{P}_p(v)$ of generating a given word $v = au$ from the state p is defined inductively by $\mathbf{P}_p(a)\mathbf{P}_{p.a}(u)$.

An ϵ-machine is *exactly synchronizable* or simply *exact* if the corresponding partial strongly connected automaton is synchronizing in our terms. Given an initial probability distribution $\pi : Q \mapsto R_+$ on the states of an ϵ-machine, the probability of generating a word v is equal to the weighted sum $\mathbf{P}_\pi(v) = \sum_{q\in Q} \pi_q \mathbf{P}_q(v)$.

Based on various applications, there are two basic settings for synchronization. In the first setting, the observer knows that an error appeared in the corresponding system and he can apply the reset sequence for reestablishing correct behavior of the system. Apparently, the most natural measure of synchronization in this setting is the reset threshold of the corresponding automaton. This is because the reset threshold corresponds to the minimum time required to find out the current system state.

In the second setting, observer either doesn't know that an error appeared or cannot affect to the system after that. For such situations it is natural to estimate either the probability of generating a reset word (if it exists) by the system itself or the average uncertainty in predicting the current state by the generated sequence in a given period of time.

[1] We write $\mathbf{P}_q(a)$ for the probability of generating a from q instead of $\mathbf{P}(q, a)$

2 Computing Synchronization Rate

Let $\mathscr{A} = \langle Q, \Sigma, \delta, \mathbf{P} \rangle$ be an exact ϵ-machine and denote $n = |Q|$. It has been proved in [6] that the probability of generating only non-reset words of length L decay exponentially fast as $src(\mathscr{A})^L$ where $0 < src(\mathscr{A}) < 1$ is a so-called *synchronization rate constant* can be defined as

$$src(\mathscr{A}) = \lim_{L \to +\infty} (\mathbf{P}_\pi(NSYN_L))^{1/L}$$

where $NSYN_L$ is the set of non-reset words of length L and π is a steady state distribution on the states. Since $\mathscr{A}$ is strongly connected, this value doesn't depend on the initial distribution π. It is also shown in [6] that the synchronization rate constant can be approximated with any given accuracy in exponential time in terms of the number of machine states n. In this section we show how to approximate $src(\mathscr{A})$ with any given accuracy in polynomial time. As well as in [6], for this purpose, let us consider the auxiliary *semi ϵ-machine*[2] $\mathscr{A}_2 = \langle Q_2, \Sigma, \delta_2, \mathbf{P} \rangle$ where $Q_2 = \{(p, q) \mid p, q \in Q, p \neq q\}$. Given a pair of different states $p, q \in Q$ and a letter $x \in \Sigma$, define

$$\delta_2((p,q),x) = \begin{cases} (\delta(p,x), \delta(q,x)), & |\{p.x, q.x\}| = 2 \\ \text{undefined otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_{(p,q)}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{P}_p(x), & |\{p.x, q.x\}| = 2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Let $T(\mathscr{A}_2, x)$ be the $n(n-1) \times n(n-1)$ matrix of the transition probabilities of $\mathscr{A}_2$ for the letter $x \in \Sigma$ indexed by the states of Q_2. That is, for each two states of $s, t \in Q_2$ the entry on the intersection of s-th row and t-th column is given by

$$T(\mathscr{A}_2, x)_{s,t} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{P}_s(x), & \delta_2(s,x) = t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

The transition probability matrix $T(\mathscr{A}_2)$ of $\mathscr{A}_2$ is now defined as the sum

$$T(\mathscr{A}_2) = \sum_{x \in \Sigma} T(\mathscr{A}_2, x).$$

[2] By semi ϵ-machine we mean a partial automaton with edges weighted by real numbers in the range $[0, 1]$. We still refer to these weights as probabilities.

Let $R^L_{p,q}$ be the sum of (p,q)-th row entries of $T(\mathscr{A}_2)^L$. Notice that by definition 2, $R^L_{p,q}$ is the probability of generating words by ϵ-machine $\mathscr{A}$ of length L from p which doesn't merge the pair $\{p,q\}$. Define also

$$R^L_p = \sum_{q\in Q, p\neq q} R^L_{p,q} \quad \text{and} \quad MaxR^L_p = \max_{q\in Q, p\neq q} R^L_{p,q}.$$

A construction of a polynomial time algorithm for approximation synchronization rate constants is based on the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *For each state $p \in Q$ the probability of generating a non-reset sequence of length L from p is upper bounded by R^L_p and is lower bounded by $MaxR^L_p$.*

Proof. Let v be a non-reset word of length L generated by $\mathscr{A}$ from the state p. Then there exists another state $q \in Q$ such that v doesn't merge p and q in $\mathscr{A}$. This means that v takes the pair (p,q) to another proper pair (p',q') and thus the probability of generating this word is included in $R^L_{p,q}$. The upper bound follows.

Now let q be the state such that $R^L_{p,q} = MaxR^L_p$. Let u be a word of length L which doesn't merge the pair $(p,q) \in Q_2$, that is, u is an arbitrary word which probability is included in the (p,q)-th row. Then u is non-reset and the lower bound follows.

Since $\mathscr{A}$ is strongly connected and synchronizing, it has a unique positive steady state distribution $\pi \in R^n_+$ (see e.g. [3]). Hence we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1.

$$\sum_{p\in Q} \pi_p MaxR^L_p \leq \boldsymbol{P}_\pi(NSYN_L) \leq \sum_{p\in Q} \pi_p R^L_p. \tag{4}$$

Thus we get that the probability of generating non-reset words of length L is lower bounded by $\pi_{min} \parallel T(\mathscr{A}_2)^L \parallel_1$ and is upper bounded by $n^2\pi_{max} \parallel T(\mathscr{A}_2)^L \parallel_1$. Taking the power $1/L$ we get that the synchronization rate constant is given by the maximal eigenvalue of the transition probabilitiy matrix $T(\mathscr{A}_2)$ whence the main result of this section follows.

Theorem 2. *Given an exact n-state ϵ-machine $\mathscr{A}$, its synchronization rate constant can be approximated in a polynomial time $\phi(n,\delta)$ for arbitrary small absolute error $\delta > 0$.*

Notice also, that Corollary 1 can be used to estimate the probability of generating non-reset words of a given length in a polynomial time.

3 Computing Prediction Rate

In the previous section we show how to compute synchronization rate constants for exact ϵ-machines. It turns out that if an ϵ-machine is not exact, it is still can be synchronized but only asymptotically, that is, for almost every infinite word $\overrightarrow{x}$ the observer uncertainty decay exponentially fast as a^L after reading L first symbols of x [7].

Let an ϵ-machine $\mathscr{A} = \langle Q = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}, \Sigma, \delta, \mathbf{P}\rangle$ generates a word w, denote by $\phi(w) \in R^n$ the observer *belief distribution*, that is,

$$\phi(w)_q = \frac{\sum_{p \in Q | p.w = q} \pi_p \mathbf{P}_p(w)}{\sum_{p \in Q} \pi_p \mathbf{P}_p(w)}$$

where $q \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and π is the initial distribution of $\mathscr{A}$. Clearly, $\phi(w)$ is a stochastic vector and q-th entry is equal to the probability that $\mathscr{A}$ is in the state q after generating w. In particular, if w is reset then $\phi(w)$ has only one non-null entry, equals 1. Let $\Phi_L \equiv \phi : \Sigma^L \mapsto R^n$ be the random variable for the belief distribution over states induced by the first length-L word the machine generates, and $\overline{S}_L$ be the most likely state in Φ_L (if a tie the lowest numbered state is taken). Denote by $Q_L \equiv 1 - \mathbf{P}(\overline{S}_L)$ the combined probability of all other states in the distribution Φ_L. Then $\mathscr{A}$ is said to be *asymptotically synchronizing* if $\mathbf{P}(Q_L > \delta)$ vanishes to 0 while $L \to +\infty$ for each $\delta > 0$. In other words, for almost every infinite word the observer uncertainty in predicting the current machine state vanishes to 0 (see [7] for details).

It is proved in [7] that actually each ϵ-machine is asymptotically synchronizing, and Q_L vanishes to 0 exponentially fast, that is, $\mathbf{P}(Q_L > a^L)$ also vanishes to 0 for some $0 < a < 1$ while $L \to +\infty$. However, no algorithm for computing infimum of such a is given in [7]. Let us call this infimum the *prediction rate constant* of an ϵ-machine and denote it by $prc(\mathscr{A})$. Below we show that the prediction rate constant is always positive whenever ϵ-machine is not exact, present a polynomial time algorithm for approximating it, and simultaneously prove the aforementioned result from [7], apparently in a simpler way. Notice also that the prediction rate constant is equal to 0 for exact ϵ-machines.

In what follows, let $\mathscr{A}$ be non-exact. Suppose $\mathscr{A}$ generates a word w. Denote by f_w the state with maximal $\mathbf{P}_p(w)$ among $p \in Q$ and by s_w the state with maximal $\mathbf{P}_p(w)$ among $p \in Q$ such that $p.w \neq f_w.w$ (if a tie the lowest numbered state is taken). In these terms, we can bound $Q_L(w)$ as follows.

Lemma 1. *For some constants c_1, c_2 depended only on the machine, we have*

$$c_1 \frac{\boldsymbol{P}_{s_w}(w)}{\boldsymbol{P}_{f_w}(w)} \leq Q_L(w) \leq c_2 \frac{\boldsymbol{P}_{s_w}(w)}{\boldsymbol{P}_{f_w}(w)}. \tag{5}$$

Proof. By the definition of Q_L we have $Q_L(w) = \frac{\sum_{p \in Q | p.w \neq q} \pi_p \mathbf{P}_p(w)}{\sum_{p \in Q} \pi_p \mathbf{P}_p(w)}$ for $q \in Q$ with maximal $\phi(w)_q$.

Since $f_w.w \neq s_w.w$, either $f_w.w \neq q$ or $s_w.w \neq q$ whence at least one of the components $\pi_{s_w}\mathbf{P}(w), \pi_{f_w}\mathbf{P}(w)$ is contained in the sum $\sum_{p \in Q | p.w \neq q} \pi_p \mathbf{P}_p(w)$. Since also $\mathbf{P}_{s_w}(w) \leq \mathbf{P}_{f_w}(w)$ we get

$$\sum_{p \in Q | p.w \neq q} \pi_p \mathbf{P}_p(w) \geq \pi_{min} \mathbf{P}_{s_w}(w),$$

where $\pi_{min} = \min_{q \in Q} \pi_q$. By the choice of q and s_w we get

$$\sum_{p \in Q | p.w \neq q} \pi_p \mathbf{P}_p(w) \leq 1 - \pi_{f_w} \mathbf{P}_{f_w}(w) \leq \pi_{s_w} \mathbf{P}_{s_w}(w).$$

By the definition of f_w we also get

$$\pi_{min} \mathbf{P}_{f_w}(w) \leq \sum_{p \in Q} \pi_p \mathbf{P}_p(w) \leq \mathbf{P}_{f_w}(w).$$

Thus we can choose $c_1 = \pi_{min}, c_2 = \frac{\pi_{max}}{\pi_{min}}$ and the lemma follows.

The following lemma gives us a way to calculate the prediction rate constant.

Lemma 2.

$$\lim_{L \to \infty} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(1/Q_L^{1/L})} \leq prc(\mathscr{A}) \leq \lim_{L \to \infty} \mathbb{E}(Q_L^{1/L}).$$

Proof. Let $a > 0, \delta > 0$ be some constants. if $\mathbf{P}(Q_L > (a+\delta)^L)$ does not vanish to 0, then $\mathbb{E}(Q_L^{1/L}) \geq a$ for L big enough. From the other hand, if $\mathbf{P}(Q_L > (a-\delta)^L)$ vanishes to 0 then $\mathbb{E}(1/Q_L^{1/L}) \geq 1/a$ for L big enough. The lemma follows.

Thus, in order to design an algorithm for computing prediction rate constant, it is enough to calculate $\mathbb{E}(Q_L^{1/L})$ and then to prove that

$$1/\mathbb{E}(1/Q_L^{1/L}) \sim \mathbb{E}(Q_L^{1/L}).$$

For these purposes we need the definition of associated *edge-machine* as in [7]. Let M be an ergodic irreducible Markov chain with the equilibrium distribution $(\rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots, \rho_l)$. Let $I(w,k,j)$ denotes the indicator function of the transition from the state k to the state j by the word w. That is, $I(w,k,j) = 1$ if $\delta(k,w) = j$ and 0 otherwise. The edge machine M_{edge} is the Markov chain whose states are the outgoing edges of the original machine M. That is, the states are the pairs (x,k) such that $\mathbf{P}_k(x) > 0$, and the transition probabilities are defined as: $\mathbf{P}((x,k) \mapsto (y,j)) = \mathbf{P}_j(y)I(x,k,j)$. A sequence of M_{edge} states visited by the Markov chain corresponds to a sequence of edges visited by the original machine M with the same probabilities. It follows, that M_{edge} is also ergodic and the following remark is also straightforward.

Remark 1. The equilibrium distribution of M_{edge} is given by $(\rho_{p,x})_{p\in M, x\in\Sigma}$ where $\rho_{p,x} = \rho_p \mathbf{P}_p(x)$.

In contrast to [7], we consider M_{edge} machines for *deadlock components* of original semi-machine $\mathscr{A}_2$ instead of $\mathscr{A}$. As in the previous section we consider the same auxiliary automaton $\mathscr{A}_2 = \langle Q_2, \Sigma, \delta_2, \mathbf{P}\rangle$. Since $\mathscr{A}$ is not exact, there are pairs $\{p,q\}$ that cannot be synchronized, that is $|\{p,q\}.v| \neq 1$ for each word u (this follows from [6][Theorem 3]). Such pairs are called *deadlock*. Let $\{p,q\}$ be a deadlock pair. It follows from the definition, that for each $a \in \Sigma$ if $p.a$ is defined then $q.a$ is also defined and $\{p.a, q.a\}$ is also deadlock. Hence there are closed under the actions of the letters strongly connected components of deadlock pairs in $\mathscr{A}_2$. Since $\mathscr{A}$ is aperiodic, these components are also irreducible ϵ-machines. Let us denote the set of such components by $\mathscr{M}$.

The following remark follows from the fact that the probability of coming to closed components of the graph is positive.

Remark 2. There is a constant $0 < c < 1$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}_z(\{w \mid \exists p,q(|\{p,q\}.w| > 1, (p,q).w \notin \mathscr{M})\}) \leq c^{|w|}, \text{ for each } z \in Q.$$

In simpler terms, it is stated in the remark that with probability asymptotically closed to 1 all pairs of states in $\mathscr{A}_2$ either merge or come to deadlock pairs. Let us also notice that the constant c from the remark is given by the dominant eigenvalue of the transition matrix of $\mathscr{A}_2$ without deadlock components whence it can be approximated in polynomial time.

As in [7] we use the theorem from [8] which in simpler terms can be formulated as follows.

Lemma 3 ([8]). *Let $Z_0, Z_1, \ldots$ be a finite-state, irreducible Markov chain, with state set $R = \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$ and equilibrium distribution $\rho = (\rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots, \rho_K)$. Let $F : R \mapsto \mathbb{R}, Y_L = F(Z_L)$, and $\overline{Y_L} = \frac{1}{L}(Y_0 + \cdots + Y_{L-1})$. Denote also $E_\rho(F) = \sum_k \rho_k F(r_k)$. Then, there exist $0 < \alpha < 1, \beta > 0$ such that for each $\epsilon > 0$ and each state k for L big enough we have*

$$\boldsymbol{P}_k(|\overline{Y_L} - E_\rho(F)| \geq \epsilon) \leq e^{-L\beta\epsilon^2} = \alpha^L.$$

Now let $M \in \mathscr{M}$ and M_{edge} be the corresponding edge-machine. Given a state r of M_{edge}, or equivalently an edge between two states (p, q) and (p', q') labeled by x, define $F(r) = \ln \frac{\mathbf{P}_p(x)}{\mathbf{P}_q(x)}$. Due to Lemma 3 for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}_{(p,q)}(|\overline{Y_L} - E_\rho(F)| > \epsilon) \leq \alpha^L$$

for L big enough.

Given any initial pair of states (p, q) and a random word w of length L, we have

$$[\overline{Y_L} \mid Z_0 = (p, q)](w) = \frac{1}{L} \ln \frac{\mathbf{P}_p(w)}{\mathbf{P}_q(w)}$$

by the definition of M_{edge} and F. Hence we get

$$\mathbf{P}(\exp(\mathbb{E}_M - \epsilon) \leq (\frac{\mathbf{P}_p(w)}{\mathbf{P}_q(w)})^{1/L} \leq \exp(\mathbb{E}_M + \epsilon)) \geq 1 - \alpha^L, \qquad (6)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_M = E_\rho(F)$.

Lemma 4. *$\mathbb{E}_M > 0$ for each $M \in \mathscr{M}$.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that for each pair (p, q) of M the sum $\sum_{x \in \Sigma_p} \rho_{(p,q,x)} F((p, q, x))$ is non-negative and there is a pair for which this sum is positive. Since $\rho_{(p,q,x)} = \rho_{(p,q)} \mathbf{P}_p(x)$, by Remark 1 this sum equals

$$\rho_{(p,q)} \sum_{x \in \Sigma_p} \mathbf{P}_p(x) (\ln \frac{\mathbf{P}_p(x)}{\mathbf{P}_q(x)}).$$

Let us use Lagrange's method to prove the inequalities. Consider the function

$$\phi \doteq \phi(z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}, \ldots, z_{x_{|\Sigma_p|}}, \lambda) = \sum_{x \in \Sigma_p} \mathbf{P}_p(x)(\ln \mathbf{P}_p(x) - \ln z_x) + \lambda z_x - \lambda.$$

By taking derivatives for each variable we get that ϕ can have minimum only in the solution points of the system

$$\begin{cases} \phi'_{z_x} = \lambda - \frac{\mathbf{P}_p(x)}{z_x}, \\ \sum_{x \in \Sigma_p} z_x = 1; \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

and in the boundary points $z_x = 1$ (since $\phi \to +\infty$ for $z_x \to +0$). If for some $x, z_x = 0$ then for each $y \neq x$ other $z_y = 0 = \mathbf{P}_p(y)$ and $\phi = 0$. In the opposite case, we have $\lambda = \frac{\mathbf{P}_p(x)}{z_x}$ for each $x \in \Sigma_p$. Since

$$\sum_{x \in \Sigma_p} z_x = \sum_{x \in \Sigma_p} \mathbf{P}_p(x) = 1,$$

this can happen only if $\mathbf{P}_p(x) = z_x$ for each $x \in \Sigma_p$ whence $\phi = 0$.

Thus $\phi = 0$ if and only if $\mathbf{P}_p(x) = z_x$ for each $x \in \Sigma_p$ such that $\mathbf{P}_p(x) > 0$ and $\phi > 0$ otherwise. Due to the condition of states non-equivalence we get that for some pair (p, q) in M this condition doesn't hold. The lemma follows.

Lemma 5. *For each $M \in \mathscr{M}$ and each $\delta > 0$ we have $\mathbb{E}(1/Q_L^{1/L}) \leq \exp(\mathbb{E}_M) + \delta$ for L big enough.*

Proof. First notice that for each pair of states p_1, p_2 we get

$$\mathbb{E}(1/Q_L(w \mid p_1)^{1/L})/\mathbb{E}(1/Q_L(w \mid p_2)^{1/L}) \to 1.$$

This follows from the fact that one can assign to each word u_1 generated from p_1 the unique word $v_{p_1,p_2}u_1$ generated from p_2, where v_{p_1,p_2} is a fixed word labeling some path from p_2 to p_1. This means that we can take any state p and consider only words generated from p to estimate the limit of $\mathbb{E}(1/Q_L^{1/L})$.

Given a word w of length L generated from p by Lemma 1 we get

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}_p(w)}{Q_{Lp}(w)^{1/L}} \leq \mathbf{P}_p(w)(\frac{\mathbf{P}_{f_w}(w)}{\mathbf{P}_{s_w}(w)})^{1/L}.$$

If $f_w \neq p$ then $\mathbf{P}_{s_w}(w) \geq \mathbf{P}_p(w)$. In the opposite case, $\mathbf{P}_{s_w}(w) \geq \mathbf{P}_q(w)$ for any $q \neq p$. Hence summing up for all length L words we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(1/Q_L^{1/L}) \leq \sum_{q \neq p} \sum_{w \mid f_w = q} \mathbf{P}_p(w)(\frac{\mathbf{P}_q(w)}{\mathbf{P}_p(w)})^{1/L} + \\ + \sum_{w \mid f_w = p} \mathbf{P}_p(w)(\frac{\mathbf{P}_p(w)}{\mathbf{P}_g(w)})^{1/L}, \tag{8}$$

where g is some state such that the pair (p, g) belongs to M. Suppose (p, q) doesn't belong to any $M \in \mathscr{M}$. By Remark 2 and inequality 6 for both summands and each $\epsilon > 0$ for L big enough we have

$$\mathbb{E}(1/Q_L^{1/L}) \leq (1-\alpha^L)(\sum_{(p',q')|M_{p',q'}} \frac{\lambda_{p',q'}}{\exp(\mathbb{E}(M_{p',q'})-\epsilon)} + \\ + \lambda_p \exp(\mathbb{E}(M)+\epsilon)) + (c^{0.5L}+\alpha^{0.5L})D, \quad (9)$$

where $M_{p',q'} \in \mathscr{M}$ contains the pair (p', q'),

$$\lambda_{p',q'} = \sum_{w|f_w=q,(p,q).w[0..0.5L]=(p',q')} \mathbf{P}_p(w) \geq 0, \sum \lambda_{p',q'} + \lambda_p = 1,$$

$0 < \alpha < 1$ is from inequality 6 and D is the maximum of $\frac{1}{\mathbf{P}_q(x)}$ among all $x \in \Sigma$ and $q \in Q$ such that $\mathbf{P}_q(x) > 0$. Since $\exp(\mathbb{E}(M_{p,q})) > 1$ and for each ϵ this inequality holds for L big enough, the lemma follows.

Lemma 6. *For $M \in \mathscr{M}$ with minimal $\mathbb{E}_M$ and each $\beta > 0$ we have $\mathbb{E}(Q_L^{1/L}) \leq 1/\exp(\mathbb{E}_M) + \beta$ for L big enough.*

Proof. By Lemma 1 we have $Q_L(w)^{1/L} \leq (c_2 \frac{\mathbf{P}_{s_w}(w)}{\mathbf{P}_{f_w}(w)})^{1/L}$. Using Remark 2 we also get that

$$\mathbb{E}(Q_L^{1/L}) \leq c^{0.5L} + \sum_{(p,q)\in\mathscr{M}} \lambda_{p,q} (c_2 \frac{\mathbf{P}_q(w)}{\mathbf{P}_p(w)})^{1/0.5L},$$

where $\sum \lambda_{p,q} = 1$.

Thus by inequality 6 for each $\epsilon > 0$ we get

$$\mathbb{E}(Q_L^{1/L}) \leq c^{0.5L} + \alpha^{0.5L} + (1-\alpha^{0.5L}) \sum_{(p,q)\in\mathscr{M}} \lambda_{p,q} (c_2)^{1/0.5L} \frac{\lambda_{p,q}}{\exp(\mathbb{E}(M_{p,q})-\epsilon)}. \quad (10)$$

for L big enough. The lemma follows.

Now our second main result follows from Lemma 5 and Lemma 6.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a non-exact ϵ-machine. Then the prediction rate of $\mathscr{A}$ is given by the maximum of $1/\exp(\mathbb{E}(M))$ among $M \in \mathscr{M}$. Therefore since $\mathbb{E}(M) > 0$ by Lemma 4 $pr(\mathscr{A}) < 1$ and $\mathscr{A}$ is asymptotically synchronizable.*

The following corollary follows from the fact that the dominant eigenvectors of $M \in \mathscr{M}$ can be approximated in polynomial time.

Corollary 2. *Given a non-exact ϵ-machine $\mathscr{A}$, the prediction rate of $\mathscr{A}$ can be approximated in polynomial time within any given precision.*

4 Conclusions

Thus it turns out that there are polynomial-time approximation schemes (PTAS) for computing the natural measures of synchronization for stochastic setting for both exact and asymptotic cases while no polynomial time algorithm can approximate the reset threshold even with logarithmic performance ratio, and even for the binary alphabet case [2] (see also [1],[4],[5]) unless $P = NP$.

The author is grateful to Prof. Jürgensen for his generous support during conducting this research.

References

1. Berlinkov, M.: Approximating the Minimum Length of Synchronizing Words Is Hard. Theory of Computing Systems, 2013, DOI doi:10.1007/s00224-013-9511-y.
2. Berlinkov, M.: On two Algorithmic Problems about Synchronizing Automata, 2013, arXiv:1312.2226
3. Berlinkov, M.: Synchronizing Quasi-Eulerian and Quasi-One-Cluster Automata, Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci., 24, 729 (2013), DOI:10.1142/S0129054113400157
4. Eppstein, D.: Reset sequences for monotonic automata. SIAM J. Comput. 19:500–510, 1990.
5. Gerbush, M., Heeringa, B.: Approximating Minimum Reset Sequences. 15-th Implementation and application of automata, Lect. Notes Comp. Sci. 6482, pp. 154–162, Springer, Berlin (2011)
6. Travers, N., Crutchfield, J.: Exact Synchronization for Finite-State Sources, J. Stat. Phys. 145:5 pp. 1181–1201, 2011.
7. Travers, N., Crutchfield, J.: Asymptotic Synchronization for Finite-State Sources, J. Stat. Phys. 145:5 pp. 1202–1223, 2011.
8. Glynn, P., Ormoneit. D.: Hoeeffding's inequality for uniformly ergodic Markov chains. Stat. Prob. Lett., 56(2):143–146, 2002.